

1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar # 139669
2 City Attorney
3 RONALD P. FLYNN, State Bar # 184186
4 Chief Deputy City Attorney
5 YVONNE R. MERE, State Bar # 173594
6 Chief of Complex & Affirmative Litigation
7 OWEN J. CLEMENTS, State Bar # 141805
8 SARA J. EISENBERG, State Bar # 269303
9 JAIME M. HULING DELAYE, State Bar #
270784
10 Deputy City Attorneys
11 Fox Plaza
12 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor
13 San Francisco, CA 94102
14 Telephone: 415.554.3597
15 jaime.hulingdelaye@sfcityatty.org

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff The People of the
17 State of California, acting by and through
18 San Francisco City Attorney Dennis J.
19 Herrera*

20 Additional counsel appear on signature page

21 Kaspar Stoffelmayr (pro hac vice)
22 kaspar.stoffelmayr@bartlitbeck.com
23 Katherine M. Swift (pro hac vice)
24 kate.swift@bartlitbeck.com
25 BARTLIT BECK LLP
26 54 West Hubbard Street
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: 312.494.4400
Facsimile: 312.494.4440

27 Charles J. Stevens (SBN 106981)
28 cstevens@gibsondunn.com
Joshua D. Dick (SBN 268853)
jdick@gibsondunn.com
Kelsey J. Helland (SBN 298888)
khelland@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: 415.393.8200
Facsimile: 415.393.8306

29 *Attorneys for Defendant Walgreen Co.*

30 Additional counsel appear on signature page

31 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
32
33 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

34 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

35 THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
36 FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA and THE PEOPLE
37 OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Acting by
38 and through San Francisco City Attorney DENNIS
39 J. HERRERA,

40 Plaintiffs,

41 v.

42 PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.

43 Defendants.

44 Case No. 3:18-cv-07591-CRB-JSC

45 **JOINT STATUS UPDATE**

46 **Judges:** Hon. Charles R. Breyer and
Jacqueline Scott Corley

47 **Courtroom:** Via Videoconference

48 **Hearing Date:** December 18, 2020

49 **Hearing Time:** 9:00 a.m.

1 The parties respectfully submit this Joint Status Update in advance of the Court's
 2 discovery conference scheduled for December 18, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

3 **I. JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING SCHEDULE AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

4 The parties jointly report on a number of case developments that have taken place since
 5 the last conference with the Court.

6 **A. Deposition Protocol**

7 On November 20, 2020, the parties submitted a stipulation and proposed order on a
 8 remote deposition protocol which, among other things, sets forth the proposed procedure for
 9 depositions during the pandemic, establishes a further deadline (January 15, 2021) for the parties
 10 to present propose numerical limitations on depositions, and allows each side to take up to 10
 11 depositions in the interim. Dkt. 387. The Court has not yet entered the order, and the parties are
 12 prepared to address any questions the Court may have about it.

13 **B. Designation of Remand Record**

14 On December 2, 2020, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation of Designation of Remand
 15 Record Pursuant to JPML Rule 10.4(a). Dkt. 391.

16 **C. Briefing on Mode of Trial**

17 On November 20, 2020, and December 10, 2020, respectively, Plaintiff and Defendants
 18 filed their simultaneous opening and responsive briefs "addressing whether the Court must hold a
 19 bench or jury trial on" Plaintiff's UCL, FAL, and nuisance claims (the claims remaining after the
 20 motion to dismiss order). *See* Dkts. 385, 387, 395-96. Plaintiff takes the position that all three
 21 claims may be tried by the Court; Defendants argue that they must be tried by a jury.

22 **D. Order re Motion to Certify Order for Interlocutory Appeal**

23 The Distributor Defendants moved the Court to certify portions of its motion to dismiss
 24 Order for interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Dkt. 327. The Court denied the
 25 motion on November 9, 2020. Dkt. 344.

26 **E. Order re Endo International's Motion for Reconsideration**

27 Defendant Endo International plc, moved for reconsideration of the order denying its
 28 motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Dkt. 321. The Court denied the motion on

1 December 7, 2020. Dkt. 392.

2 **F. Teva's Petition for Writ of Mandamus**

3 Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. filed a petition for writ of mandamus, asking the
 4 Ninth Circuit to reverse the Court's denial of Teva's motion to dismiss for lack of personal
 5 jurisdiction. Plaintiff's response is due on December 23, 2020.

6 **G. Related Case**

7 On October 14, 2020, a separate case, *Smith v. Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-
 8 05451-CRB, was related to this one and assigned to Judge Breyer. Walgreens filed its Motion to
 9 Dismiss on November 20, 2020. Dkt. 35. Plaintiff's opposition brief is due December 29, 2020,
 10 and Walgreens' reply brief is due January 12, 2021. The hearing date for the motion is scheduled
 11 for January 28, 2021.

12 **H. Discovery Motions**

13 The parties have briefed a number of disputes pursuant to the revised resolution protocol
 14 outlined in Discovery Order No. 2. The disputes are identified in the chart below for ease of
 15 reference.

Moving Party	Responding Party	Dispute	Dkt.
Plaintiff	McKesson	Geographic and temporal scope of McKesson's document productions	397
Manufacturer Defendants	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's responses to certain interrogatories	399
Manufacturer Defendants	Plaintiff	Plaintiff's responses to RFPs on claims and encounter data and mortality records	400
All Defendants	Plaintiff	Deadline for further supplementation re abatement categories	401
Plaintiff	Allergan	Allergan's responses to RFPs re settlement with Teva	403
Plaintiff	Endo	Temporal scope, custodians, and other issues relevant to Plaintiff's RFPs	

25 **II. PLAINTIFF'S STATEMENT**

26 The parties have continued to work diligently since the last status conference. This
 27 statement outlines the status of issues the parties have resolved and those that will require the
 28

1 Court's input.

2 **A. Plaintiff's Discovery Efforts**

3 **1. PFS Amendment**

4 Plaintiff served a Third Amended Plaintiff Fact Sheet on November 6, 2020, and a Fourth
 5 Amended Plaintiff Fact Sheet on December 11, 2020. The Third Amended Plaintiff Fact Sheet
 6 added specificity to the categories of abatement the People seek and revised certain responses to
 7 reflect the dismissal of the City and County of San Francisco as a party to the case. The Fourth
 8 Amended Fact Sheet reflects amendments to certain categories of information requested by
 9 Defendants, including the approximate date on which the People were first injured, additional
 10 specificity as to the forms of injunctive, legal, and equitable relief sought, and further clarification
 11 of the departments relevant to the People's proposed categories of abatement and the employees
 12 whose documents are within the People's possession, custody, or control.

13 **2. Plaintiff's Ongoing Production**

14 Since the last status conference, Plaintiff has produced an additional 58,695 documents,
 15 comprising 264,027 pages, which brings Plaintiff's total production to 157,739 documents and
 16 868,396 pages. These productions include responsive documents from a non-custodial database
 17 from the Department of Public Health ("DPH") as well as emails collected from 23 custodians
 18 across eight San Francisco departments: DPH, the Office of the Medical Examiner, the Police
 19 Department, the Fire Department, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing,
 20 the Department Public Works, the Adult Probation Department, and the Library. Plaintiff
 21 continues to collect and review documents from additional custodians and databases identified
 22 to Defendants, and production of those documents will continue on a rolling basis.

23 **B. Defendants' Productions**

24 As indicated in the previous submission, certain Defendants have deemed produced in
 25 this action documents produced in other related cases in response to Plaintiff's requests for
 26 production, but many have refused to identify with sufficient specificity the purportedly
 27 responsive documents in those productions. A number of defendants have also produced zero
 28 documents—or very close to it—collected specifically for this case, including Allergan (0

1 documents), Noramco (0 documents), Teva (0 documents) and Walgreens (6 documents).

2 **C. Schedule for Expert Reports**

3 Shortly after the last conference before the Court, Judge Breyer entered the Order re Joint
 4 Status Update, which held that the “parties shall simultaneously exchange initial expert reports on
 5 June 11, 2021 and rebuttal reports on July 16, 2021.” Dkt. 356. Five days later, Your Honor
 6 entered Discovery Order No. 2, which did not reference Judge Breyer’s Order re Joint Status
 7 Update but set a deadline of April 16, 2021, for “Plaintiff’s expert disclosures.” Dkt. 382 at 2.
 8 These deadlines appear to conflict, and it is unclear to Plaintiff which one is operative.¹

9 Plaintiff respectfully submits that if the April deadline currently controls, then that
 10 deadline should be vacated and the issue revisited at a later date. Several considerations inform
 11 this suggestion.

12 First, Defendants’ interest in early expert disclosures will likely be satisfied by Plaintiff’s
 13 commitment to providing even more detail on the categories for which it intends to seek
 14 abatement prior to serving expert reports. The initial justification for advancing Plaintiff’s expert
 15 deadline was to address Defendants’ purported need for further details to inform their fact
 16 discovery on abatement. Plaintiff maintains that this is unnecessary for a host of reasons
 17 addressed in briefing before the Court. *See* Dkt. 401. Regardless, in the spirit of compromise,
 18 Plaintiff has committed to providing even more detail through a further PFS amendment.
 19 Defendants complain below that none of the PFS amendments “provides anything close to an
 20 expert disclosure on remedies”—this is true and precisely the point. The PFS was never intended
 21 to—and simply cannot, for a host of reasons—substitute for expert reports. That’s not what it is
 22 for. What it can and will provide, however, is all the information Defendants need to propound
 23 any legitimate fact discovery. Plaintiff therefore believes that Defendants’ interest in early expert
 24 disclosures will be moot, and that the most prudent course of action is to either ratify the June
 25 deadline reflected in the Order re Joint Status Update or to vacate the expert report deadlines set
 26 forth in Discovery Order No. 2 and revisit the issue following Plaintiff’s further disclosures.

27 ¹ Shortly after Your Honor issued Discovery Order No. 2, Plaintiff asked Defendants to join an
 28 email to the Courtroom Deputy seeking clarification. Defendants refused and advised that, in
 their view, the “appropriate way” to raise this issue “is via the next status conference statement.”

1 Second, disclosing expert reports before the close of fact discovery has the potential to
 2 create more problems than it solves, as additional post-expert fact discovery may require
 3 Plaintiff's experts to issue supplemental reports accounting for that additional discovery. *See*
 4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e). This sequence would also be inconsistent with the procedure adopted in
 5 other opioid case tracks and arguably in tension with the spirit of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(D)(i),
 6 which sets a default expert disclosure deadline just 90 days before trial.

7 Third, since the last conference, the Track 3² trial previously set for May 2021 has been
 8 continued to October 2021, and the plaintiffs' expert reports in that track will—subject to
 9 confirmation from the court—be due on April 16, 2021, the same date that Your Honor proposed
 10 for the People's expert reports in this case (and 28 days after the close of all fact discovery in that
 11 case). Although no experts have been disclosed in either track, it should come as no surprise to
 12 Defendants here that there is likely to be considerable overlap between the Track 3 experts—
 13 many of whom were disclosed and vetted in previous tracks—and those who will be used in this
 14 case. The expert reports are detailed and labor-intensive, and it would be inefficient and
 15 unnecessarily burdensome to require the experts to prepare reports for two jurisdictions
 16 simultaneously. In addition, simultaneous plaintiff reports would complicate subsequent expert
 17 deposition scheduling for both plaintiffs and defendants.

18 Defendants' suggestion below that this is a conflict “of Plaintiff's own making” is entirely
 19 misleading, and their accusation that Plaintiff manufactured a conflict for strategic advantage is
 20 unbecoming and untrue. Yes, an attorney representing the People participated in the negotiations
 21 of the Track 3 deadlines, but the Track 3 plaintiffs initially proposed expert disclosure deadlines
 22 in mid-March and modified their proposal to accommodate input from the special master and,
 23 importantly, the **defendants'** insistence that the schedule allow more time for fact discovery.
 24 Moreover, the proposal was made at a time when—because Defendants requested that the parties
 25 wait to seek clarification—the operative deadline in this case remained unclear.

26

27

28 ² Track 3 or “CT3” refers to the case before Judge Polster brought by two counties in Ohio
 against the retail pharmacies in their capacities as dispensers (as opposed to distributors).

1 **D. Other Matters Likely to Need the Court's Attention**

2 **1. Walgreens' Dispensing Data**

3 Plaintiff notes that Court intervention may soon be required with respect to the production
 4 of Walgreens' dispensing data, which will inform Plaintiff's expert analysis and is a necessary
 5 predicate for the "red flag analysis" that Defendants have demanded during the fact discovery
 6 period. The parties continue to meet and confer about the contours of that data, including (1) the
 7 geographic scope (whether data will be provided for all of California, only for San Francisco, or
 8 something in between) and (2) whether the data will include the opioid codeine. Depending on
 9 the outcome of these negotiations, Plaintiff may seek guidance from this Court in the near future
 10 on one or both of these issues.

11 In the meantime, however, Walgreens has indicated that it has already prepared a data file
 12 on a San Francisco-only basis that excludes codeine, but it refuses to produce that file while the
 13 parties meet and confer about the remaining two issues. Walgreens has represented multiple
 14 times that the San Francisco data is already one click away. Plaintiff would appreciate the Court
 15 encouraging Walgreens to produce it now, which will allow Plaintiff to make significant progress
 16 even while negotiating the contours of additional discovery.

17 **2. Criminal Record Information**

18 Plaintiff does *not* agree with Defendants that Court intervention should be necessary with
 19 respect to a stipulation regarding criminal record information. California law provides
 20 significant, non-negotiable protections for documents containing Criminal Offender Record
 21 Information ("CORI"), such that the City Attorney's Office and outside counsel cannot even
 22 review documents containing CORI, let alone produce them to Defendants, without entry of a
 23 court order. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 703(b) ("Criminal offender record information
 24 may be released, on a need-to-know basis, only to persons or agencies authorized by court order,
 25 statute, or decisional law to receive criminal offender record information."). What Defendants
 26 characterize below as Plaintiff's "refusal" to review documents containing CORI absent court
 27 order is nothing more than Plaintiff's insistence on following the law.

28 Defendants' demands for documents containing CORI are unprecedented in Plaintiff's

1 civil litigation experience. Nevertheless, Plaintiff has worked diligently to resolve this
 2 issue. Upon further examination of Plaintiff's legal obligations, Plaintiff proposed changes to the
 3 stipulation on December 3, 2020, to account for the requirement under California law that
 4 Defendant demonstrate a "compelling need" prior to the production of documents containing
 5 CORI. *See Cal. Penal Code § 13300(c)* ("The local agency may furnish local summary criminal
 6 history information, upon a showing of a compelling need . . ."). Plaintiff proposed that prior to
 7 the production of any documents containing CORI, the parties submit to the Court a proposed
 8 order with a simple two-column chart containing Plaintiff's description of the documents at issue
 9 in one column and Defendants' statement of need in another. Plaintiff is eager to submit the
 10 stipulation to the Court, which will facilitate review of documents. Defendants have not
 11 suggested any revisions and posed written questions about Plaintiffs' December 3 proposal for the
 12 first time in an email sent during the parties' meet and confer about this status report on
 13 December 16. Plaintiff responded in less than an hour and confirmed, per Defendants' request,
 14 how CORI is defined and that CORI protections implicate police records. Plaintiff is amenable to
 15 providing its proposal the Court for its own consideration.

16 **E. Proposed Agenda for Status Conference**

17 Plaintiffs submit that the status conference should address the issues outlined herein.

18 **III. DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT**

19 **A. Matters Likely to Need the Court's Attention**

20 The parties are meeting and conferring on a number of matters related to discovery
 21 requests that are not yet ripe for the Court's consideration. However, Defendants believe that the
 22 following issues may require the Court's attention as this case progresses.

23 **1. Deadlines for Expert Reports**

24 On November 12, 2020, Judge Breyer entered an order setting a deadline of June 11,
 25 2021, for the simultaneous exchange of expert reports. Dkt. 356. On November 17, 2020, this
 26 Court set a deadline of April 16, 2021, for Plaintiff's initial expert disclosures, Dkt. 382,
 27 confirming the Court's oral order during the discovery conference on November 12, 2020.
 28 Plaintiff has suggested there is some ambiguity between these two orders, and some question

1 whether this Court's November 17 order is effective. Defendants disagree that there is any
 2 confusion on this point, as this Court is charged with handling discovery, and has issued an order
 3 consistent with the last status conference and the Court's statements in several status conferences
 4 regarding the importance of Plaintiff providing certain expert discovery early, so that Defendants
 5 can conduct necessary additional fact discovery.

6 Plaintiff's assertion that providing additional updates to the Plaintiff Fact Sheet solves this
 7 problem falls short. To date, Plaintiff has served *four* amended fact sheets, and none of them
 8 provides anything close to an expert disclosure on remedies. Indeed, Plaintiff has taken the
 9 position that it *cannot* provide key information until expert discovery, including information
 10 related to its purported abatement remedies. For that reason alone, Plaintiff's expert disclosures
 11 should remain due on the April 16, 2021, date set by the Court.

12 Moreover, Plaintiff's complaint that the April 16 deadline conflicts with the not-yet-
 13 entered MDL deadline for plaintiffs' expert reports in Track 3 ignores the fact that Plaintiff's
 14 counsel here also negotiated the new schedule in the MDL. The MDL Track 3 schedule was
 15 reached by agreement of the parties. In fact, Plaintiff's counsel here ***proposed the April 16***
deadline in Track 3, long after this Court had already entered the April 16 deadline here. Any
 16 conflict in the two case schedules is of Plaintiff's own making and was presumably by design.
 17

18 Finally, as the party with the burden of proof, Plaintiff's expert disclosures should come
 19 first, no matter when they are due. On Plaintiff's proposed schedule, Defendants would not
 20 receive essential information until Plaintiff's expert reports. Defendants will need time to review
 21 those reports and depose Plaintiff's experts before responding. Setting a schedule with staggered
 22 expert reports—with Defendants' reports following Plaintiff's reports—is also consistent with the
 23 expert disclosure schedules set in the MDL bellwether cases, including the Track 3 schedule
 24 negotiated by Plaintiff's counsel in this case. There is no reason to deviate from that practice, and
 25 good reason not to.

26 **2. California Board of Pharmacy Subpoenas**

27 Your Honor heard oral argument on the California Board of Pharmacy's Motion to Quash
 28 Defendants' subpoena on December 3, 2020. Dkt. 390. Among other things, this Court deferred

1 ruling on certain of Defendants' document requests to the Board that are similar to requests
 2 pending before the California Court of Appeal, specifically those seeking investigation files,
 3 administrative records, and CURES data. Defendants wish to bring to the Court's attention that
 4 these issues affect other outstanding subpoenas, including subpoenas to the California
 5 Department of Justice (discussed further below), the California State Medical Board, and the
 6 Dental Board of California, which also seek CURES data and investigation files. Given the
 7 importance of the information Defendants seek from these third-parties, significant delays in any
 8 rulings from the California courts may require Defendants to seek relief from the schedule.

9 **3. California Department of Justice Subpoena**

10 On behalf of Defendants, McKesson served a document subpoena on the California
 11 Department of Justice (CA DOJ) on September 22, 2020. Since that time, McKesson has met and
 12 conferred repeatedly with counsel for CA DOJ. The parties have managed to narrow the areas of
 13 dispute, but CA DOJ continues to object to producing certain categories of documents and data,
 14 including investigation files and CURES data.³ Defendants do not want to burden the Court with
 15 motion practice that, like the Board of Pharmacy discovery, the Court has determined must await
 16 resolution of the pending state court writ proceedings; but Defendants also need to ensure that
 17 they preserve their rights to enforce the subpoena. Defendants therefore request the Court's
 18 guidance on whether the disputed issues should be briefed now and held in abeyance, or deferred
 19 for the time being.

20 **4. Criminal Record Information**

21 At Plaintiff's request, the parties negotiated a stipulation regarding the production of
 22 Criminal Record Information ("CRI"). Defendants believed that negotiation was completed in
 23 November. But after Defendants provided authority for filing the stipulation with the Court,
 24 Plaintiff demanded a new provision that would require the Court to find a "compelling need"
 25 before discoverable information could be produced pursuant to the stipulation. Defendants
 26 promptly met and conferred with Plaintiff on this changed position and are working through
 27

28 ³ Although the Board of Pharmacy is in possession of some CURES data, CA DOJ has custody
 over the database itself.

1 various questions about it. But Defendants are concerned that Plaintiff's belated changes to this
 2 stipulation—and Plaintiff's refusal to review any documents that could contain CRI before a
 3 stipulation is entered, or even define what sort of documents it intends to withhold as containing
 4 CRI—jeopardizes the schedule.

5 **B. Status of Party Discovery**

6 **1. Defendants' Discovery Requests**

7 Defendants are meeting and conferring with Plaintiff regarding Plaintiff's responses to
 8 Walgreen's second and third requests for production and first and second set of interrogatories,
 9 and Plaintiff's responses to Distributors' first requests for production and first and second set of
 10 interrogatories. To date, Plaintiff has not produced important information required to be
 11 produced at the outset of the case, including the investigative files of the healthcare providers
 12 identified in the Plaintiff Fact Sheet as having been investigated concerning their prescribing of
 13 Prescription Opioids. Plaintiff reports that the delay is related to COVID-19. To date, Plaintiff
 14 has been unable to confirm which of its custodial files are substantially complete, but has agreed
 15 to provide this information in the near future.

16 **2. Defendants' Document Productions**

17 Plaintiff is already in possession of tens of millions of pages of documents that
 18 Defendants produced in the MDL and other opioid litigation. For certain Defendants, this
 19 includes tens of thousands of documents from custodians with information specific to
 20 San Francisco who also happen to have non-San Francisco-specific information. *See, e.g.*, ECF
 21 No. 397 at 4 n.7. Other Defendants, like Noramco, do not have custodians with information
 22 specific to San Francisco.

23 Since the last status conference, Defendants have made additional productions. These
 24 include productions by Janssen, ABDC, and Par. Certain Defendants' lack of or relatively low
 25 productions to date are largely attributable to the ongoing meet and confer process. For example,
 26 Walgreens has been negotiating with Plaintiff over the scope of production of patient prescription
 27 dispensing data for months. Plaintiff has made multiple new requests regarding the scope of that
 28 production just in the past week. Walgreens cannot agree to produce its dispensing data until

1 those negotiations are complete, given the sensitivity of the patient medical information contained
 2 in the data.

3 Moreover, the number of additional documents produced by certain Defendants in this
 4 case, as represented by Plaintiff above, is misleading and does not reflect that those documents
 5 include extensive jurisdiction-specific transactional data and Order Monitoring Program data that
 6 has been produced. Defendants will continue to work closely with Plaintiffs to finalize
 7 custodians and search terms and anticipate rolling out numerous additional productions once
 8 those negotiations are complete.

9 **3. Plaintiff's Discovery Requests**

10 The parties are meeting and conferring regarding responses to Plaintiff's requests for
 11 production from Teva, ABDC, Endo, Cardinal Health, Anda, Noramco, Janssen, and Walgreens.
 12 These issues are not ripe for the Court's consideration.

13 **C. Status of Other Third-Party Discovery**

14 At the last status conference, Plaintiff reported that it has deemed certain San Francisco
 15 departments and entities as outside of Plaintiff's custody and control. Defendants either have
 16 issued, or will issue, subpoenas to those San Francisco entities likely to have discoverable
 17 information, among other third-party subpoenas.

18 Since submission of the last joint case management statement, Defendants have served
 19 third-party subpoenas on Aetna, Anthem Blue Cross Life & Health Insurance, Co., Blue Shield of
 20 California, California Public Employees' Retirement System, Cigna Health & Life Insurance,
 21 Co., OptumRx, Express Scripts, Inc., University of California San Francisco Office of Medical
 22 Affairs & Governance, and the San Francisco District Attorney. Service of certain other third-
 23 party discovery has been delayed due to COVID-19.

24
 25 DATED: December 17, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

26
 27 DENNIS J. HERRERA
 City Attorney
 28 RONALD P. FLYNN
 YVONNE R. MERE
 OWEN J. CLEMENTS

/s/ Elizabeth J. Cabraser
 Elizabeth J. Cabraser
 Richard M. Heimann
 Paulina do Amaral
 Kevin R. Budner
 Michael Levin-Gesundheit

1 SARA J. EISENBERG
 2 JAIME M. HULING DELAYE
 Deputy City Attorneys
 Fox Plaza
 3 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Telephone: 415/554-3957
 jaime.hulingdelaye@sfcityatty.org

5 Aelish M. Baig
 6 Matthew S. Melamed
 Hadiya K. Deshmukh
 7 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD
 LLP
 8 Post Montgomery Center
 One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
 9 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: 415/288-4545
 10 415/288-4534 (fax)
 aelishb@rgrdlaw.com

11 Thomas E. Egler
 12 Carissa J. Dolan
 13 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD
 LLP
 14 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
 San Diego, CA 92101
 Telephone: 619/231-1058
 15 619/231-7423 (fax)
 tome@rgrdlaw.com
 cdolan@rgrdlaw.com

17 Jennie Lee Anderson
 18 Audrey Siegel
 ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP
 19 155 Montgomery Street, Suite 900
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: 415/986-1400
 20 415/986-1474 (fax)
 jennie@andrusanderson.com
 audrey.siegel@andrusanderson.com

22 Edward Chapin
 SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP
 23 655 West Broadway, Suite 1700
 San Diego, CA 92101
 Telephone: 619/577-4253
 24 619/577-4250 (fax)
 echapin2@sanfordheisler.com

Jacob H. Polin
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
 BERNSTEIN, LLP
 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94111-3339
 Telephone: 415.956.1000
 Facsimile: 415.956.1008
 ecabraser@lchb.com

Paul J. Geller
 Mark J. Dearman
 Dorothy P. Antullis
 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP
 120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500
 Boca Raton, FL 33432
 Telephone: 561/750-3000
 561/750-3364 (fax)
 pgeller@rgrdlaw.com
 mdearman@rgrdlaw.com
 dantullis@rgrdlaw.com

Louise Renne
 RENNE PUBLIC LAW GROUP
 350 Sansome Street, Suite 300
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: 415/848-7240
 415/848-7230 (fax)
 lrenne@publiclawgroup.com

Kevin Sharp
 SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP
 611 Commerce Street, Suite 3100
 Nashville, TN 37203
 Telephone: 615/434-7000
 615/434-7020 (fax)
 ksharp@sanfordheisler.com

David S. Casey, Jr.
 Gayle M. Blatt
 Alyssa Williams
 CASEY GERRY SCHENK FRANCAVILLA
 BLATT & PENFIELD LLP
 110 Laurel Street
 San Diego, CA 92101-1486
 Telephone: 619/238-1811
 619/544-9232 (fax)
 dcasey@cglaw.com
 gmb@cglaw.com
 awilliams@cglaw.com

1
2 Ellen Relkin
WEITZ & LUXENBERG P.C.
3 700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
Telephone: 212/558-5500
4 212/344-5461 (fax)
erelkin@weitzlux.com

5 Melinda Davis Nokes
WEITZ & LUXENBERG P.C.
1880 Century Park East
6 Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: 310/247-0921
310/786-9927 (fax)
mnokes@weitzlux.com

7 Paul F. Novak
Tiffany Ellis
WEITZ & LUXENBERG, P.C.
8 24th Floor, The Fisher Building
3011 W. Grand Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Tel: (313) 800-4170
9 pnovak@weitzlux.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff The People of the State of California, acting by and through San Francisco
City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera*

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 DATED: December 17, 2020

2 By: /s/ Steven J. Boranian

3 Steven J. Boranian (Bar No. 174183)
4 Luke S. Porter (Bar No. 323847)
REED SMITH LLP
5 101 Second Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 543-8700
Facsimile: (415) 391-8269
sboranian@reedsmit.com
lporter@reedsmit.com

6
7 Eric J. Buhr (Bar No. 217528)
Sarah B. Johansen (Bar No. 313023)
REED SMITH LLP
8 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 457-8000
Facsimile: (213) 457-8080
ebuhr@reedsmit.com
sjohansen@reedsmit.com

9
10
11
12
13
14 *Attorneys for Defendant*
15 *AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation*

16
17
18
19
20 Respectfully submitted,

21 By: /s/ Sonya D. Winner

22 Sonya D. Winner (Bar No. 200348)
Nathan E. Shafrroth (Bar No. 232505)
Isaac D. Chaput (Bar No. 326923)
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
Salesforce Tower
23 415 Mission Street, Suite 5400
San Francisco, California 94105-2533
Telephone: + 1 (415) 591-6000
Facsimile: + 1 (415) 591-6091
swinner@cov.com
nshafroth@cov.com
ichaput@cov.com

24
25 *Attorneys for Defendant*
26 *McKesson Corporation*

27 By: /s/ Neelum J. Wadhwani

28 Neelum J. Wadhwani (Bar No. 247948)
Colleen McNamara (pro hac vice)
Enu A. Mainigi (pro hac vice)
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 434-5000
Fax: (202) 434-5029
nwadhwani@wc.com
emainigi@wc.com

Edward W. Swanson, SBN 159859
August Gugelmann, SBN 240544
SWANSON & McNAMARA LLP
300 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 477-3800
Facsimile: (415) 477-9010
ed@smllp.law
august@smllp.law

27
28
29
30 *Attorneys for Defendant*
31 *Cardinal Health, Inc.*

1 By: /s/ Zachary W. Byer
2 Zachary W. Byer (S.B. #301382)
3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
4 555 South Flower Street
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071
6 Tel: (213) 680-8400
7 zachary.byer@kirkland.com

8 Jennifer G. Levy, P.C. (pro hac vice)
9 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
10 1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
11 Washington, D.C. 20004
12 Tel: (202) 879-5000
13 Fax: (202) 879-5200
14 jennifer.levy@kirkland.com

15 Donna Welch, P.C. (pro hac vice)
16 Timothy W. Knapp, P.C. (pro hac vice)
17 Karl Stampfl (pro hac vice)
18 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
19 300 North LaSalle, Chicago, IL 60654
20 Tel: (312) 862-2000
21 Fax: (312) 862-2200
22 donna.welch@kirkland.com
23 tknapp@kirkland.com
24 karl.stampfl@kirkland.com

25 *Attorneys for Defendants Allergan Finance,
26 LLC f/k/a Actavis, Inc. f/k/a Watson
27 Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Allergan Sales, LLC
and Allergan USA, Inc.*

28 By: /s/ Amy R. Lucas
1 Amy R. Lucas (S.B. #264034)
2 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
3 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 8th Floor
4 Los Angeles, CA 90067
5 Tel: (310) 553-6700
6 Fax: (310) 246-6779
7 alucas@omm.com

8 Charles C. Lifland (S.B. #108950)
9 Sabrina H. Strong (S.B. #200292)
10 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
11 400 South Hope Street
12 Los Angeles, CA 90071

13 By: /s/ Elizabeth A. Sperling
14 Elizabeth A. Sperling (CA Bar No.
15 231474)
16 ALSTON & BIRD LLP
17 333 South Hope Street, 16th Floor
18 Los Angeles, CA 90071
19 Telephone: (213) 576-1000
20 Fax: (213) 576-1100
21 elizabeth.sperling@alston.com

22 Daniel G. Jarcho (pro hac vice)
23 ALSTON & BIRD LLP
24 950 F Street, NW
25 Washington, DC 20004
26 Telephone: (202) 239-3300
27 Daniel.jarcho@alston.com

28 Cari K. Dawson (pro hac vice)
1 Scott A. Elder (pro hac vice)
2 Jenny A. Hergenrother (pro hac vice)
3 ALSTON & BIRD LLP
4 1201 West Peachtree Street, Suite 4900
5 Atlanta, GA 30309-3424
6 Telephone: (404) 881-7000
7 cari.dawson@alston.com
8 scott.elder@alston.com
9 jenny.hergenrother@alston.com

10 *Attorneys for Defendant Noramco, Inc.*

11 By: /s/ Zachary Hill
12 Zachary Hill (S.B. #275886)
13 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
14 One Market, Spear Street Tower
15 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
16 Tel: (415) 442-1000
17 zachary.hill@morganlewis.com

18 Wendy West Feinstein (*pro hac vice*)
19 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
20 One Oxford Centre, 32nd.FL
21 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-6401
22 Tel: (412) 560-7455
23 wendy.feinstein@morganlewis.com

24 *Attorneys for Defendants
25 Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.;*

1 Tel: (213) 430-6000
2 Fax: (213) 430-6407
3 clifland@omm.com
4 sstrong@omm.com

5 Amy J. Laurendeau (S.B. #198321)
6 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
7 610 Newport Center Drive, 17th Floor
8 Newport Beach, CA 92660
9 Tel: (949) 823-6900
10 Fax: (949) 823-6994
11 alaurendeau@omm.com

12 Stephen D. Brody (pro hac vice)
13 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
14 1625 Eye Street, NW
15 Washington, DC 20006
16 Tel: (202) 383-5300
17 Fax: (202) 383-5414
18 sbrody@omm.com

19 *Attorneys for Defendants Johnson &*
20 *Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,*
21 *Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals,*
22 *Inc., and Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc.*

23 By: /s/ Alan R. Ouellette
24 Alan R. Ouellette (CA Bar No. 272745)
25 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
26 555 California Street, Suite 1700
27 San Francisco, CA 94104-1520
Telephone: (415) 434-4484
Facsimile: (415) 434-4507
aouellette@foley.com

28 James W. Matthews (Pro Hac Vice)
Ana M. Francisco (Pro Hac Vice)
Katy E. Koski (Pro Hac Vice)
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
111 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02199-7610
Telephone: (617) 342-4000
Facsimile: (617) 342-4001
jmatthews@foley.com
afrancisco@foley.com
kkoski@foley.com

29 *Attorneys for Defendant Anda, Inc.*

Cephalon, Inc.; Actavis LLC; Actavis
Pharma, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc.;
Watson Laboratories, Inc.; Warner
Chilcott Company LLC; Actavis South
Atlantic LLC; Actavis Elizabeth LLC;
Actavis Mid Atlantic LLC; Actavis
Totowa LLC; Actavis Kadian LLC;
Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc. f/k/a
Watson Laboratories, Inc.-Salt Lake
City; and Actavis Laboratories FL, Inc.
f/k/a Watson Laboratories, Inc.-Florida

30 By: /s/ Sean O. Morris
31 Sean O. Morris (SBN 200368)
32 John D. Lombardo (SBN 187142)
33 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE
34 SCHOLER LLP
35 777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor
36 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5844
37 Tel: (213) 243-4000
38 Fax: (213) 243-4199
39 Sean.Morris@arnoldporter.com
40 John.Lombardo@arnoldporter.com

41 *Attorneys for Defendants Endo*
42 *Pharmaceuticals Inc., Endo Health*
43 *Solutions Inc., Par Pharmaceutical, Inc.,*
44 *and Par Pharmaceutical Companies,*
45 *Inc.*

46 By: /s/ Charles J. Stevens
47 Charles J. Stevens (SBN 106981)
48 cstevens@gibsondunn.com
49 Joshua D. Dick (SBN 268853)
50 jdick@gibsondunn.com
51 Kelsey J. Helland (SBN 298888)
52 khelland@gibsondunn.com
53 GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
54 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
55 San Francisco, CA 94105
56 Telephone: 415.393.8200
57 Facsimile: 415.393.8306

58 Kaspar Stoffelmayr (pro hac vice)
59 kaspar.stoffelmayr@bartlitbeck.com
60 Katherine M. Swift (pro hac vice)

kate.swift@bartlitbeck.com
BARTLIT BECK LLP
54 West Hubbard Street
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: 312.494.4400
Facsimile: 312.494.4440

Alex Harris (pro hac vice)
alex.harris@bartlitbeck.com
BARTLIT BECK LLP
1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200
Denver, CO 80202
Telephone: 303.592.3100
Facsimile: 303.592.3140

Attorneys for Defendant Walgreen Co.

ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the above signatories.

Dated: December 17, 2020

By: /s/ Elizabeth J. Cabraser

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that, on December 17, 2020, service of this document was accomplished
3 pursuant to the Court's electronic filing procedures by filing this document through the ECF
4 system.

5 _____
6 /s/ *Elizabeth J. Cabraser* _____

Elizabeth J. Cabraser

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28